

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 25, 37 and 42 are currently being amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and drawings, and in particular in FIG. 1 and the corresponding description in the specification. Claims 26 and 38 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being added.

This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 25, 27-29, 37, 39-40, 42-43 and 48-50 are now pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 25-29 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Independent claim 25 has been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action, and applicants submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 25-28, 37-40, 42, 43 and 48-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,222,157 to Yoneda et al. (“Yoneda”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,821,107 to Naito et al. (“Naito”). Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneda and Naito in view of well known prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 25 recites “a control panel including a first touch screen menu including a trial printing button configured to, when user selected, initiate a trial preceding

print of image data without an additional user selection, and a printing button configured to, when selected by a user, initiate printing of all pages of the image data in response to the selection of the printing button.” Yoneda and Naito fail to disclose at least this feature of claim 25 in the context of that claim, or the advantages resulting therefrom.

Yoneda discloses in FIG. 12 a conditional display panel 117, which is part of the display section 12 shown in FIG. 10. In the conditional display panel “ALL” or “PARTIAL” may be selected. The Patent Office equates the selection of “ALL” and “PARTIAL” with the printing button and trial preceding print button, respectively, of the claims.

In contrast to claim 25, however, selection of “PARTIAL” in the Yoneda system does not “initiate a trial preceding print of image data without an additional user selection.” Rather, as disclosed in col. 17, line 67 to col. 18, line 7, once the partial mode is selected, a page number or numbers are input through the key pad 129, and then presumably another selection must be performed to initiate printing. Nowhere does Yoneda disclose that once “PARTIAL” is selected, pages are printed without additional user selection. To the contrary, because the conditional display panel 117 in FIG. 12 allows a user to select a particular page number and number of copies, a user must make an additional selection to initiate printing once “PARTIAL” is selected. Naito was merely cited for disclosing setting print density information, and thus even if combined with Yoneda, the combination would not include all of the features of claim 25.

Moreover, Yoneda and Naito fail to suggest the advantages of the apparatus of claim 25. In claim 25, because a user may select a trial printing button to initiate a trial preceding print of image data without an additional user selection, the trial printing is performed immediately after the user selects the trial printing button. The user can thereby easily execute the trial printing and can judge whether the desired printing can be executed. Thus, it is possible to prevent sheets from being wasted by undesired printing, due to the automatic trial printing. Yoneda and Naito fail to suggest the apparatus of claim 25, and fail to suggest the advantages resulting therefrom.

Independent claims 37 and 42 have features corresponding to those discussed above with respect to claim 25 in the context of process claims, and are patentable for analogous reasons.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 5, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438